



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,868	11/20/2003	Hyun-kwon Chung	1293.1970	5648
49455	7590	10/31/2006	EXAMINER	
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/716,868	CHUNG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment (8/16/2006).
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION/

1. This FINAL action is responsive to the amendment filed 8/16/2006.
2. In the Amendment Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 15 and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. The claim state "can be", this phrase should be avoided because by stating, "can be displayed simultaneously" the claims do not distinctly claim the matter of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight (NPL- "bye-bye box: applet loading secrets", developer, July 9, 1998, pgs 1-4) in view of Renshaw (U.S. 6, 065, 024 filed on Mar 24, 1997).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Knight discloses a method of displaying a markup document linked to an applet, the method comprising: *Delaying display of image output information for the markup document* (pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt, An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously); Although Knight teaches the use of MediaTracker he fails to show the

simultaneous display of the embedded document with the primary document. Renshaw discloses *synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document, when rendering of the applet is complete, such that the delayed image output information for the markup document and the applet output information for the applet are displayed simultaneously* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 2, with dependency of claim 1, Although Knight briefly mentions double buffering he does not explicitly describe the buffering of the markup document. Renshaw discloses *wherein the delaying of the display of the image output information for the markup document comprises buffering the image output information for the markup document* (column 2, lines 40-67 & figure 1 numeral 44, wherein a Data Structure stores format information describing the html document). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 3, with dependency of claim 1, Although Knight teaches the use of MediaTracker he fails to show the simultaneous display of the embedded document with the primary document. Renshaw discloses *wherein the synchronously displaying the delayed image output information for the markup document and the applet output for an initial image of the applet comprises simultaneously providing the delayed image output information for the markup document and the applet output for the initial image of the applet to a display device based on an output control signal* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document thereby including an output control signal). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 4, with dependency of claim 1, Knight discloses *wherein the applet is formed of program codes having an output method different from that of the markup document* (pgs 2-3, wherein the applet code produces different output from the HTML).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 3, Although Knight teaches the use of MediaTracker he fails to show the simultaneous display of the embedded document with the primary document. Renshaw discloses *wherein the output control signal is provided from an applet executing engine, which interprets the applet, or a presentation engine, which interprets the markup document* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document thereby including an output control signal). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of

applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 1, Knight fails to explicitly disclose the buffering of the text output. Renshaw discloses *wherein the delaying of the display of the image output information for the markup document comprises buffering text output of the markup document and buffering at least one of an image output and an audio output of the markup document* (fig 4A & column 6, lines 48-65, wherein text output is buffered which includes image output). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 2, Although Knight briefly mentions double buffering he does not explicitly describe the buffering of the markup document. Renshaw discloses *wherein the buffering comprises buffering text output of the markup document and buffering at least one of an image output and an audio output of the markup document* (column 2, lines 40-67 & figure 1 numeral 44, wherein a Data Structure stores format information describing the html document). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the*

simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 3, Although Knight teaches the use of MediaTracker he fails to show the simultaneous display of the embedded document with the primary document. Renshaw discloses *wherein the delaying of the display of the image output information for the markup document comprises buffering text output of the markup document and buffering at least one of an image output and an audio output of the markup document* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document thereby including an output control signal). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Renshaw with Knight for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

7. Claims 9-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renshaw (U.S. 6, 065, 024 filed on Mar 24, 1997) in view of Knight (NPL- "bye-bye box: applet loading secrets", developer, July 9, 1998, pgs 1-4).

Regarding Independent claim 9, Renshaw discloses an information storage medium controlling a computer, comprising: *A markup document* (abstract & column 2, lines 10-67, wherein the markup document is an HTML document); *an applet linked to the markup document, wherein the applet or the markup document includes markup image output delay information used to delay display of the markup document such that image output information of the markup document and applet output information of the applet are*

to be displayed simultaneously (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document). Although Renshaw discloses the simultaneous display of the markup and applet using text buffering techniques he fails to explicitly disclose the delay of the applet. Knight discloses the pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt, An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously. Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 10, with dependency of claim 9, Renshaw discloses *wherein the applet executes in any one state of an initial state, a start state, a stop state, and a destroy state* (figure 4B numeral 490 & column 8, lines 10-15, wherein the applet executes in an initial state).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, with dependency of claim 9, Renshaw fails to explicitly disclose the use of a delay function. Knight discloses *wherein the applet includes a delay function as the markup image output delay information for synchronizing display of image output information of the markup document with display of output information of the applet* (pgs 2-3, wherein a sleep function is applied to delay a thread). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in*

the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, with dependency of claim 10, Renshaw fails to explicitly disclose the use of a delay function. Knight discloses *wherein the applet includes a delay function during the start state as the markup image output delay information for synchronizing display of image output information of the markup document with display of output information of the applet* (pgs 2-3, wherein a sleep function is applied to delay a thread). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 13, with dependency of claim 10, Renshaw fails to explicitly disclose the use of a delay function. Knight discloses wherein the applet comprises: *A delay function as the markup image output delay information, which delays display of image output information for the markup document* (pgs 2-3, wherein a sleep function is applied to delay a thread); *And a delay cancel function canceling the delay of the display of the image output information for the markup document, when rendering of an initial image of the applet is completed by the initial and start states of the applet* (although Knight doesn't explicitly use a delay cancel function, part of the standard methods used in java applet life cycle is a stop() method which acts has a canceling function).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, with dependency of claim 9, Renshaw discloses *wherein the markup document comprises tag or attribute indication information as the markup image output delay information to control synchronous display of output of the markup document with output of the applet* (column 5, lines 5-40 & column 6, lines 1-45, wherein the markup document includes tag information describing the synchronous display of output of the markup document and applet).

Regarding Independent claim 15, Renshaw discloses a computer system with a display device, comprising: *A presentation engine, which interprets a markup document to provide image output information for the markup document* (column 1, lines 25-27, wherein the presentation engine includes a web browser); *and an applet executing engine, which interprets an applet linked to the markup document to provide an applet output, wherein the presentation engine delays display of the image output information for the markup document, and synchronizes and outputs the delayed image output information of the markup document and the applet output to the display device, when an output control signal indicating completion of rendering of the applet output is input from the applet executing engine* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document. The applet-executing engine defined within the applet tag as described in column 5, lines 30-45). Although Renshaw discloses the simultaneous display of the markup and applet using text buffering techniques he fails to explicitly disclose the delay of the applet. Knight discloses the pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt. An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously. Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to*

an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.

Regarding Dependent claim 16, with dependency of claim 15, Renshaw discloses *wherein the presentation engine comprises a buffer buffering the image output information of the markup document to delay the display of the image output information for the markup document, in response to a markup image output delay signal input from the applet executing engine* (fig 4A & column 6, lines 48-65, wherein a image information to be output is buffered). Renshaw fails to disclose the delay signal. Knight discloses the pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt, An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously. Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 17, with dependency of claim 15, Renshaw discloses *wherein the presentation engine comprises an audio buffer, which buffers audio output, and a video buffer, which buffers video output, of the image output information of the markup document and/or of the applet output to delay the display of the image output information for the markup document, in response to the output control signal input from the applet executing engine* (fig 4A & column 6, lines 48-65 & column 7, lines 1-25, wherein the presentation engine includes a video buffer). Renshaw fails to disclose the delay signal. Knight discloses the pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the

java.awt, An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously. Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 18, with dependency of claim 16, Renshaw discloses *wherein the markup image output delay signal is set according to an amount of rendering time of the markup document and/or the applet* (fig 4A & column 6, lines 48-65, wherein a image information to be output is buffered). Renshaw fails to disclose the delay signal. Knight discloses the pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt, An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously. Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. *At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the*

simultaneous display of both *thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Regarding Dependent claim 21, with dependency of claim 19, Renshaw discloses simultaneously displaying an embedded HTML document that use an applet with the primary HTML document (Abstract, fig 3, column 4, lines 45-67). Renshaw does not explicitly teach the suspending of the output of the display. Knight discloses wherein the display control information is used to suspend an output for display of the markup document image until the markup document image and the linked applet image can be displayed simultaneously as the markup image (pgs 2-3, MediaTracker Object is used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt, An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. In this way the markup document will be rendered once the applet is done loading, therefore both will be displayed simultaneously). Knight discloses the use of a MediaTracker to determine loading of an applet. Renshaw discloses the Simultaneous display of embedded documents with primary html documents. Both describe the display of applets with markup documents. At *the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of an applet with a markup document. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the user from seeing portions of a presentation at different times thereby visually improving the presentation. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Knight with Renshaw for the benefits of allowing the display of a markup document linked to an applet With the simultaneous display of both thereby providing an improved document presentation by implementing a MediaTracker object.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 19 and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Renshaw (U.S. 6,065,024, Published May 16, 2000).

Regarding Independent claim 19, Renshaw discloses a *computer system with a display device, comprising: a programmed computer processor controlling synchronous output of a markup document image including a linked applet image to the display device, according to display control information included in the markup document and/or in the applet, so that the markup document image and the linked applet image are displayed simultaneously as a markup image* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein applets or embedded documents are displayed simultaneously with the Primary HTML document).

Regarding Dependent claim 20, with dependency of claim 19, Renshaw discloses *wherein the programmed computer processor controls an order of rendering of the markup document image and the linked applet image according to the display control information to synchronously and simultaneously display the markup document image and the linked applet image as the markup image* (abstract & column 2, lines 9-67 & column 3, lines 1-18, wherein the processor controls the rendering of the markup document image with the embedded document or applet image according to the control information for displaying the two documents simultaneously).

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 8/16/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 have been considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

Knight neither discloses nor suggest "delaying display of image output information for the markup document or synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document for simultaneous display" (pg 6, paragraph 4).

Renshaw also neither discloses nor suggests "delaying display of image output information for the markup document or synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for an applet linked to the markup document" (pg 6, paragraph 5).

However the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Knight discloses the use of the MediaTracker Object used to monitor the progress of the loading image and is part of the java.awt (see pages 2-3), An Applet tag within an HTML document that includes a MediaTracker Object will wait till the image is done [delay] loading before displaying the applet. For example if the image is not done loading the markup document would not be rendered because the Applet tags have not finished executing due to MediaTracker. Although Knight teaches the use of MediaTracker he fails to show the simultaneous display of the embedded document with the primary document. Renshaw discloses simultaneously displaying an embedded HTML document that use an applet with the primary HTML document (Abstract, fig 3, column 4, lines 45-67). Note that both references have been used in combination for most of the claims because using the reasonable broadest interpretation, one of ordinary skill would know how to synchronize a delayed image by the teachings of Renshaw which discloses "Embedded Html Documents Downloaded And Displayed Simultaneously With Primary HTML Document" with the MediaTracker objects supported in Java and used in applets of Knight for monitoring the loading of images including attaching identifiers to determine the order of displaying the images.

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Katinsky et al. (U.S. 6,452,609) discloses "Web Application For Accessing Media Streams"
 - Dwek (U.S. 6,248,946) discloses "Multimedia Content Delivery System And Method"
 - Harrington (U.S. Pub 2003/0145338) discloses "System And Process For Incorporating, Retrieving And Displaying An Enhanced Flash Movie"
 - Chaddha et al. (U.S. 6,173,317) discloses "Streaming and Displaying A Video Stream With Synchronized Annotations Over A Computer Network"

- Contois (U.S. 5,864,868) discloses "Computer Control System And User Interface For Media Playing"

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
October 19, 2006



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER